Speaker #1 Douglas Murray
Speaker #2 a male journalist

[Speaker 1] (0:00 - 0:33)
I've said for many years, if you import the world's people, you also import the world's problems. Fascinating that the British media and others for years talked about the Great Replacement Conspiracy Theory without ever countering it and without actually having read it. The question you got Nigel Farage on was very, very interesting.

It was interesting to see him not take your bait on that, unlike me. Obviously, you should have very large numbers of people deported in every European country. And this is not, by any means, fringe opinion.

[Speaker 2] (0:34 - 1:05)
Just very briefly on Nigel, do you think he's gone soft on this? Douglas Murray, thank you so much for joining us. We're here to talk about your New York Times and Sunday Times bestselling book on democracies and death cults.

But I want to start by asking about the UK and demographic changes in Britain, which links into your book. Demographer Paul Morland says that by 2050, Britain will be a minority white British country. Is that a concern of yours?

[Speaker 1] (1:06 - 2:11)
Well, it's something I've written about for a long time. And as you well know, Stephen, to even write about this in anything but a spirit of celebration is to tread on many of the landmines of modern Britain. I said much, if not all, of what I had to say in a book 10 years ago or so now, The Strange Death of Europe.

And I've written about demographic change in the UK for some 20 years or so. And it's very interesting that there's been a movement in the public debate from, if you make a point like that, what you're saying is not true, then what you're saying is not true, but it's good. To, OK, it is true and it's good.

To, well, that's the case anyway, so what are you going to do about it? So that's roughly how well it's progressed in the UK.

[Speaker 2] (2:12 - 2:28)
But what's your perspective on that 2050 moment? I mean, that's going to be a significant moment in British history, the first time, of course, that Britain's ethnic demographics would have been minority white British. I think a lot of people in the UK are rightly concerned about that.

[Speaker 1] (2:28 - 6:08)
Yeah, of course they're right to be concerned about it. Because even if there were no negatives that came from it, and I've always said that immigration brings some positives and some negatives, you've got to work out where the positives start to run down and where the negatives start to become overwhelming. But yes, even if there were no positive,

negative thing to work out, at least people ought to be able to acknowledge that that constitutes in the course of under a century.

One of the most significant population changes, I think, in history, really. And if, I don't know, for instance, Pakistan had moved in a century from minority white to majority white, I think that Pakistanis and others would be alarmed by that, or at least would notice it. And they might even ask, why has that happened and why does it need to happen?

But we British seem to be uniquely unwilling or unable to speak up for ourselves, defend ourselves, argue for our culture, and much more. And so I don't think any of that is inevitable. One of the interesting things about demographic change is that there are both parts of it where it's one of the best predictors, and on the other hand, is also at the same time not absolutely inevitable.

If a British government of any stripe decided that, for instance, the British public had had enough demographic change, then they could change that result. But I don't see at the moment any desire to do that on the part of the political class. And most of the political media class would like to just continue to shut that situation down.

Until such a time as you can just say, well, it is what it is. It's happened. So what are you going to do about it?

As you might remember, in The Strange Death of Europe, I quoted Boris Johnson when he was mayor of London, saying exactly that about migration into London. Because London had by, what, 2012 already had majority non-white British, which is the census in its own terms, in, I think, 23 out of 33 London boroughs. And when I and others wrote about that at the time and said, are you sure this is such an unwise good, are you sure this is great, are you sure this is something we ever voted for or wanted as a country, Boris Johnson was one of the people who came out, a conservative, of course, came out and said, well, it's happened.

That seems to be what the British political class seems to think, or most of the British political class seems to think should be their attitude towards this. I don't think that most other peoples on Earth would put up with a complete shift in their population like that. But it's doubly galling in Britain that if it's not what people want, it's what they get anyway.

Because so repeatedly at the polls and whenever we've had a chance to vote, we have actually voted for parties that have said they wouldn't do this, which leaves you feeling slightly hopeless about it.

[Speaker 2] (6:09 - 6:52)
Sajid Javid, one of Boris Johnson's conservative allies, when he was pointed out about this fact of the census demographic changes, he just merely said, so what on x? Of course, there is a huge change that happens with demographic changes. So not only does the culture of Britain change what the country looks like, changes just looking around and walking around London and places like that, Birmingham, Leicester, and other cities, but also it impacts our politics.

And that's something I know that you've written about in your latest book. One of those ethnic conflicts that may be sparking up right now is between India and Pakistan. Yes.

Are you concerned that this could have ramifications for British politics?

[Speaker 1] (6:52 - 9:07)
It already does. And everybody in politics knows this. Because for some 20 years, if you speak to any MP of any party and ask them what their post bag is like in relation to foreign affairs, they will tell you there's two things they mainly hear about.

One is the Kashmir issue, and the other is Israel-Palestine. Now, I suppose many of those politicians, if you threw them in front of a camera like this, would say, well, I mean, there might just be an upsurge of interest in the Kashmir question among Yorkshire natives. Or perhaps the Welsh are just particularly exercised about the issue of a two-state solution.

But obviously, that's not the case. I've said for many years, if you import the world's people, you also import the world's problems. And these are two of the world's problems, two big border disagreement issues, which dominate foreign interests in the UK.

And it's obviously the result of demographic change. By the way, that also has an impact on everything else in our country and in our politics. It was some 10 years ago now that the Ministry of Defense in London had a summary of future defense capabilities around the world.

And they came to the conclusion it was actually leaked to the Guardian. So you've got me in the uncommon situation of citing the Guardian for the moment. But it was actually leaked to the Guardian.

And this document from the MOD said there are areas of the world where whatever happens, Britain cannot be militarily involved because of domestic political reasons. One would obviously be the India-Pakistan issue. That's because we have a lot of Indians, a lot of Pakistanis in Britain.

And they have brought, will bring inevitably, their own attitudes towards our own politics in Britain. And everybody knows that. It's just that nobody in politics seems to know what to do about it.

Or they just do the classic thing that everyone knows, which is you just kick it down the road and you leave it to your successors, at which point it's a lot worse.

[Speaker 2] (9:07 - 9:21)
Well, in 2021 in Leicester, there were some race riots between Indians and Pakistanis over a cricket match in Pakistan. So if just a cricket match can do that, imagine what a natural conflict between those two countries could lead to in Britain.

[Speaker 1] (9:21 - 9:23)
That's what generations of British politicians have given us.

[Speaker 2] (9:24 - 9:35)
And one of the so-called solutions that perhaps the government is looking in to try and solve this, like you say, kicking the can down the road, is to ban speakers from France who raise questions about this. So René Camus.

[Speaker 1] (9:35 - 9:36)
René Camus, yeah.

[Speaker 2] (9:36 - 9:45)
This is a French philosopher who came up with the so-called Great Replacement Theory. Can you just comment on that so-called theory and why you think the government banned him from Britain?

[Speaker 1] (9:47 - 16:05)
Yes, I actually just read a long essay about René Camus' work for the New Criterion magazine, which I recommend people read if they're interested in him. He is a French writer and philosopher. He was actually of the French left in the 1970s.

He wrote a book called Tricks, which is about gay one-night stands. And it was so admired as a work of literature, if not philosophy, that it was translated into English. It was his only book until recently that was, forward by a great left-wing hero of the time, Roland Barthes.

But then René Camus wrote about things more heretical than gay one-night stands. And that was that he noticed, as he says himself in one of his books, he noticed one day leaving his part of rural France and going into one of the main cities that, as he said, he said the population had changed. And it started to interest him.

And one of the interesting things about him as a writer is that he just does say what he sees with his eyes. I interviewed him when I was researching Strange Death of Europe. The only time I met him, I interviewed him in Paris some 10 years ago.

And I was very struck by the fact that when I was trying to nail down a lot of the facts about the numbers and much more that were coming into France. And I remember him saying, I'm not interested in the numbers. I'm interested in what I can just see with my eyes.

And he gave a speech in 2010 or so called The Great Replacement. One of the things you can tell about the, I mentioned this in my essay on him in New Criterion. One of the things you can tell that's very interesting about our time and the information warfare that's going on is that Google, as you know, will tell you what you're allowed to get.

It will suggest things. And if you type in The Great, inevitably you get Gatsby and various other things, depression. But it's not until you put in the whole of the phrase The Great Replacement that you're then offered not the work of Renaud Camus or even the speech that he gave.

What you're offered is the Wikipedia page, The Great Replacement brackets conspiracy theory. So that's what it was just decided that it was. And that's what it's been decided to be for a long time.

It's fascinating that the British media and others have for years talked about the Great Replacement conspiracy theory without ever countering it and without actually having read it. Now, as it happens, as of the last nine months or so, that speech, like a lot of Camus' other work, is now available in English thanks to two small publishing houses that have

brought them out. And people can read for themselves if they want for the first time in English.

If people are monoglots, then you can read for the first time what Camus is actually saying. I see the British government's desire or decision to bar him from even entering the UK as absolutely typical of British reaction to this. I remember some, what, 17 years ago, Geert Wilders, who was then about the only member of his political party in the Netherlands having broken from the VVD, was banned from the UK for criticizing Islam, criticizing Islamic immigration, criticizing mass migration.

And you probably remember one of the seminal figures of post-war British politics, Jackie Smith, then the Home Secretary, she barred Geert Wilders from entering the UK when he was meant to come actually speak to a group of parliamentarians. And I remember saying at that time, what are you going to do when Geert Wilders is the leader of the biggest political party in the Netherlands? Well, as it happens, as of last year, Geert Wilders is the leader of the biggest political party in the Netherlands.

And it's a sign of just the endless short-sightedness, cowardice, pusillanimity of the British political class that that's what they always do. And of course, it's pathetic. Of course, it's ridiculous.

Deciding that a French philosopher in his, I think, 80s now, approaching 80, is the sort of person you should bar from the UK because you couldn't have him speaking his French thoughts. But conservative labor governments, conservatives were a bit better than labor. But they routinely allow in people who call for ethnic and religious warfare, ethnic and religious murder.

If you look at the number of British mosques from whose pulpits routinely on Fridays, and this is all captured, documented, routinely people call for things like wars on the infidel, the killing of the Jews, and much more. We have people who are allowed into the country who call for violence against Hindus. These people don't get barred, by and large.

I mean, very, very occasionally. I mean, if you're like at Osama bin Laden level of jihadists, sometimes the British Home Office will notice and ask you not to come. But it really does have to be at that level to pretend that there's any comparison between Renaud Camus and a sort of Osama bin Laden-like figure is ridiculous.

But this is all simply the weakness, the fritness, the Scots might say, of British politicians. And it seems to be endless. Everyone's asked me for years, when will the tipping point be on that?

And there isn't one. It just goes on and on. And they do nothing and nothing.

[Speaker 2] (16:06 - 16:13)
Well, you must be very happy because the BBC had you on very recently and then proceeded your interview with three panellists.

[Speaker 1] (16:13 - 16:16)
They succeeded it.

[Speaker 2] (16:16 - 16:25)
They succeeded it with three panellists who all said you were crazy, Islamophobic, whatever, including the so-called conservative former special adviser, who was just utterly bizarre.

[Speaker 1] (16:26 - 17:45)
All they knew is that I gave for the promotion of democracies and death cults. I was in the UK and did a number of large public events. And I was straight into number one on the Sunday Times bestseller list.

And I was asked onto Newsnight. And I haven't been on for many years because Newsnight, as I'm sure your viewers will appreciate me saying, moved in my own adult life from must watch to nobody watches. And it went through a couple of cycles in the meantime of absolutely impossible to watch and unwatchable.

And now nobody watches it. I did do a pre-record. They edited it down, as is their right, to about a third of the length, made sure that all of the points I made that were most salient, if I say so myself, were edited out, and then got three unemployed people on to attack me afterwards.

Not even sure I know exactly who they are. There's somebody who's a Lib Dem and somebody else. But I mean, it's nice to know that the anti-Douglas Murray industry booms in the UK.

And I'm glad that I, at any rate, am helping job creation in my country of birth in helping total ignoramuses get 70 quid or so from the BBC for showing up on a Wednesday evening.

[Speaker 2] (17:46 - 18:27)
Increasingly, in the US, the anti-Douglas Murray industry is growing. Oh, really? We'll get onto that later.

But I want to stick on Britain for the moment about the public discourse on immigration. Because I think that it's been like this for a long, long time. Ever since immigration really began after the Second World War.

And one of those post-war titans, and I'm not being ironic here, I genuinely think this, was Enoch Powell, incredibly influential, incredibly intellectual politician. You can say what you like about his views on immigration, but I think he's an incredibly impressive person. Do you think that he was a kind of prophet when it comes to the issues that Britain is facing today?

And maybe you can comment on his legacy.

[Speaker 1] (18:28 - 20:23)
Well, he was a remarkable man. And even people who were detractors of his and opponents of his, like Diane Abbott, had the courtesy to acknowledge that he was among the great orators of his era. I actually met him a few times as a boy.

He was a mesmerizing, compelling figure. And there's something very interesting about him. I mean, he didn't get everything right.

And you might say, well, who does? And there are certain parts of his famous 68th speech which are lurid and definitely didn't help his argument in certain ways. But that aside, on a range of issues, he just got a lot more right than he got wrong.

And I think that one of the, even just saying that, I can feel you clipping that to be, you know, Enoch was more right than he was wrong, or whatever, which then always creates a world of pain for anyone who says it. But then let me just add to that. The point is that if somebody is onto nothing, then before they're dead, let alone afterwards, their name is forgotten.

If somebody has a theory or a claim that is simply not true, it dies with them. But there is a reason why, all these decades later, somebody of your age, I can't remember how old you are now. 25.

25, would know the name Enoch Powell. And I imagine that from one week to the next, you very rarely think about Reginald Maudlin. Yeah, I thought so.

I don't either, by the way. I do not think of Barbara Castle, we do not discuss Ted Heath's thoughts.

[Speaker 2] (20:24 - 20:24)
Roy Jenkins.

[Speaker 1] (20:25 - 23:35)
Roy Jenkins, even. Shirley Williams is not on the tip of everyone's tongues in 2025. But Enoch Powell lingers.

And there's obviously a reason for that. There's obviously a reason for that. Just as people seem to be fearful about Renaud Camus, if his thought was so easily debunked, if his observation and what he's written about in his description of seeing with his eyes is so untrue, then why is it so dangerous?

Why is it so much to be disbarred and rejected? And the answer is, obviously, that the problem is that Camus, like Powell, was onto something. And that obviously terrifies a lot of people.

And it would, wouldn't it? To quote Mandy Rice Davis. I mean, it would, wouldn't it?

Because it highlights the failings of almost everybody else. Not just to speak, but to think. There was a very, very impressive essay that you've probably read, which was written by Roger Scruton, and I think on the, how many decades are we out from Rivers of Blood now, 50 years, 60 years?

I think on the 50th or 40th anniversary of the Rivers of Blood speech, actually the New Criterion again published an essay by Roger Scruton called Should He Have Spoken? And I think it's one of Roger Scruton's best essays on contemporary matters. And it's fascinating because he dissects something I've written about in Strange Death, which is that almost every country in Europe had a figure in the 60s, 70s, or 80s who said that this thing was happening and that we should be much more aware of it and wary of it than we were.

That demographic change, that mass immigration was going to absolutely change our societies, and most likely for the worse. Every country had a figure like that of differing varieties of, well, discernment as well as different, ones of them were more or less to one's personal taste. But Powell was obviously the British example.

You might say Jean Raspail was the French one, a figure in the Netherlands like the now late Fritz Borkestein, mainstream politician who noticed early on some of the things that his country and all of ours now have to live with. But almost all of them were just kept out of the discourse and told to be, their thought was told to be rotten and wicked and much more. But, you know, perhaps we should have listened.

[Speaker 2] (23:36 - 23:51)
You say that we now have to live with these issues and you've done an amazing job documenting some of the issues that Western countries face from mass migration, from multiculturalism, whether it's the so-called hate marches, people openly supporting Hamas, the terrorist organisation.

[Speaker 1] (23:51 - 23:53)
Yeah, that's not progress, is it?

[Speaker 2] (23:53 - 24:11)
Or whether it's inter-ethnic violence, whether it's terrorist attacks, and all of these other negatives from mass immigration. And some people are asking, well, perhaps there is a way that we can solve this. I asked Nigel Farage last year whether he supported Trump's position of mass deportations of illegal migrants.

He said no, he told me no.

[Speaker 1] (24:11 - 24:12)
I saw that interview.

[Speaker 2] (24:12 - 24:21)
But I want to ask what your view is on the solution to both legal and illegal migration and whether there is a way of reversing these demographic changes.

[Speaker 1] (24:21 - 28:49)
Yeah, well, I'm a writer, not a politician, so I don't have to answer this question, but let me do so anyway. It's very obvious to me what you are doing. And it's the same thing I've said you would do for many years now.

You massively lessen the legal migration. You massively lessen the number of people able to do, for instance, chain migration. That is, they come into the UK, get an indefinite leave to remain, then bring their family.

But frankly, this is all stuff that we knew in the 1960s and 1970s, so it's sort of ridiculous that we're still having this discussion in the 2020s when it comes to the UK. It's so just, what slow learners to still be at that stage. The question you got Nigel Farage on was very, very interesting.

It was interesting to see him not take your bait on that, unlike me. Obviously, you should have very large numbers of people deported in every European country, and this is not by any means fringe opinion. Matteo Salvini, Giorgia Maloney in Italy have talked about the need to deport, for instance, the one million people who are absolutely in their country in Italy illegally.

We know that there are at least one million people in Britain illegally. By the way, I don't trust that number, just like I don't trust many of the numbers, because the one million illegal figure has remained the same for about the last 15 years. And I can't help thinking, as I see boats coming in day after day to the south coast of England, among other places, that it would be weird if the figure was so static.

But obviously, if people have broken into your country, they should not remain. They've broken the law. And I would add to that that it's obviously the case that if people are in your country and hate your country and are preaching against your country and much more, you deport them.

And in America, this, once again, is completely mainstream. This is Donald Trump's opinion. If you've broken into America and they start with the people who are here and are committing the crimes, then you deport them.

I don't know why this should be so difficult, but I suppose, inevitably, one reason is that in one technical way, it is difficult. You would have to, for instance, have a functioning home office that knew who was in the UK. You would need to have border forces that actually believed that the borders of UK are not a sort of construct of some kind, some sort of ethereal, non-existent, non-real thing.

And you would have to have a policy, which you were committed to and followed through on, of making sure that people who broke into your country and, first of all, the ones who commit crime and much more are deported. Now, that is difficult in some ways, in many ways. And I've talked with a lot of politicians in America as across Europe about the difficulties of this.

But what is more difficult in the long run? Doing that or never doing it and simply allowing the problem to get worse and worse. How much money does the UK pay now per day in housing people who've broken into the UK illegally in hotels?

It's more than you and I pay to the tax man, I'm sure, in our lives or anyone we know has ever been able to pay. I mean, most people we know can't afford to live in a hotel day after day. Why do we, the taxpayer, pay for thousands and thousands of illegal immigrants to live in hotels that we can't afford to live in ourselves?

This makes no sense to me, other than, as I say, the old argument that goes right back to 68 and earlier, which is politicians put things off for another day for their successors to deal with or not deal with, at which point the problem is always worse.

[Speaker 2] (28:49 - 28:52)
Just very briefly on Nigel, do you think he's gone soft on this?

[Speaker 1] (28:56 - 29:28)
I think he probably just doesn't want to go there. I wrote about his disagreement with his fellow MP, Rupert Lowe, in Spectator the other week, and it seemed clear to me. I thought what Rupert Lowe said about this seemed all to me to be eminently sensible and in line with what Donald Trump is advocating in America and mainstream politicians are advocating across Europe.

I think Nigel Farage just doesn't want to be the person to call for that, that you'd have to ask him why. Did you?

[Speaker 2] (29:29 - 29:37)
I asked him whether, well, first of all, I asked him why, and he said, because it's politically impossible, and I said, well, is it even your ambition to deport all illegal migrants?

[Speaker 1] (29:37 - 29:38)
And then he said no.

[Speaker 2] (29:38 - 29:41)
And he said no. But he seems to maybe have shifted his view today.

[Speaker 1] (29:41 - 31:18)
Well, he should shift his view, because first, it's extremely important for the country, and secondly, the American president and others are showing it can be done. If America can deport people who've broken into America and joined criminal gangs and much more, why can we in Britain not deport the Muslim rape gang members who've been convicted? Who've been convicted?

Somebody will say there's a couple who have been. But again, as I wrote recently in The Spectator, quite a number of the people who were convicted of that, who had dual nationality, Pakistani and British, gave up their Pakistani passports in the meantime, knowing how slow our system is in the UK, and they just held onto their British passport in the knowledge that, therefore, the British passport couldn't be taken away, because otherwise they would become stateless, and because of our various legal obligations that are wildly dated and not fit for purpose in the modern world, they won't do that. But there are plenty of ways if you had a strong, intelligent, patriotic British government, there are plenty of ways in which you could say, for instance, we give foreign aid to Pakistan, not a penny of foreign aid till you take these rapists back. Just not a penny.

And you can forget about a lot of the other things that we give you as well.

[Speaker 2] (31:19 - 32:12)
You can stop issuing visas. I mean, that's what the Trump administration has been doing. And you talked about the US, it's really interesting.

They've been revoking visas of students who are supporting Hamas. A lot of people on the right and sort of the free press type people are saying this is an attack on freedom of speech. Maybe you can comment on that.

But also, I'm gonna throw in something else to the question. In Britain, there's a lot of radical Muslims, but there's also just a big Muslim population who have views which you and I probably don't agree with, and the vast majority of Brits wouldn't agree with. So there was some opinion polls recently suggesting 46% of British Muslims have sympathy for Hamas.

52% want it illegal to show a picture of the Prophet Muhammad. So what does one do with these people who hold such anti-Western, anti-liberal views, and particularly the radical ones? So can you comment on the free speech issues and on the British sort of integration?

[Speaker 1] (32:12 - 36:51)
The free speech issue is ridiculous. I just saw last night a video of my friend, Jordan Peterson at the Oxford Union the other day, where a guy who I think is the head of the union, who's obviously Muslim himself, immediately asked about this as if it was the issue of our time. And, you know, obviously he has sectarian reasons for obsessing about this.

But as Jordan pointed out, I mean, the freedom of Muslim students and others to protest against Israel for defending herself against the death cult of Hamas, students in the UK and the US have had a wildly free reign to do that. In the US, students like the group that this guy Khalil from Columbia were a part of spent months shutting down normal student life on their university. And they were allowed to do so.

And they were allowed to chase Jewish students across campus shouting, go back to Poland, or saying to their Jewish contemporaries that they should be the next targets of the rapists and murderers and beheaders of Hamas. They've had a very, very free reign, actually, to do all of this. And to call, for instance, as the Columbia student group that this guy Khalil, who everyone's decided is a free speech martyr, that group called for the complete overthrow of Western civilization.

If you go to a country and you call for the overthrow of that country, it would seem to me to be a little lacking in self-awareness. If I would think that I would get very short shrift if I was to move to Pakistan and to spend my time on a visa calling for the overthrow of the Pakistani government. Although the Pakistani people managed to do that quite often themselves.

I mean, there is no reason why a society should, free speech rights and other things for citizens is a different thing, but there is no reason why a society should be greatly encouraging of people coming into it who hate the society in question and state that they want to overthrow it. And then much more. And when it's Muslim students who go to the United States or United Kingdom and bring their vicious sectarian conflicts with them, I think this is a big challenge because we don't really, we should be quite clear, we don't really want more sectarian strife.

We don't really want the importing of religious hatreds and much more. And it isn't the case that we are not free societies unless we allow in people who hate us and want to overthrow us and our system of government and our system of life. If this would be the easiest question to address this, it wouldn't be, these people would not have anywhere near the amount of support they did if you turned this onto any other race, any other group of people.

If America had in recent years imported a large number of people who were meant to be studying and furthering their education in the United States, but they chose to come to the United States and to call for the lynching of black Americans, I would expect not just black Americans, but everybody else in society to say, excuse me, you've come as a guest and you're now threatening, calling for the mass murder of our black brothers and sisters and friends, no way, scram.

Why in this case? It goes back to this thing, they think an 80-year-old French philosopher is a deep threat to the peace, but young people who support a group that calls for the annihilation of the Jewish race and then all the other infidel next, they think they're not a problem. By the way, you mentioned the figures on support of Hamas.

What was it again? 46. 46%, just consider that.

[Speaker 2] (36:51 - 36:52)
Sympathy with Hamas.

[Speaker 1] (36:52 - 37:55)
Yeah, that means there are millions of people in the UK who sympathize with the most vicious, rapist, murderous, tortuous organization on earth. So they are sympathizers with that or in total denial. And there was one poll I saw some months ago that said I think only one in four British Muslims polled believed, believed that there had been rapes and murders carried out by Hamas on October the 7th.

Well, I've written a book which among other things, documents some of that firsthand. But just consider what that means for Britain. Just consider what it means.

That means there are millions of people in Britain who sympathize with Hamas or want to simply deny that Hamas is what it is in order to continue their support of them. That's not a problem for Israel. That's a problem for us in Britain.

And we are just such fools, such fools.

[Speaker 2] (37:55 - 38:04)
Jordan, the Middle Eastern country. Not the Canadian. Not the Canadian.

Just banned the Muslim Brotherhood. Do you think that Britain should do the same?

[Speaker 1] (38:04 - 39:08)
Of course. First morning's work by any sensible government. We've been warned.

I mean, Jordan is a country in significant strife and has its own problems. But we've been warned for a long time by leaders in the Middle East, not least the leadership of the United Arab Emirates that we in Britain are very, very foolish to be so much less aware of the problem of radical Islam than they are themselves. And there's a formula I like to use sometimes against the ignoramuses and cowards who use the terms like Islamophobia against anyone who cites this, which is I like to say, and it's true, anyone who doesn't think there's a problem with radical Islam doesn't have enough Muslim friends.

Because if they did, they'd know that. Because any Muslim knows that. Everybody knows that.

Everyone in the Middle East knows that. I think people in the Middle East don't know the difference between trying to hold a country vaguely stable and it being run by Hamas or Hezbollah. Ask the people of Lebanon.

[Speaker 2] (39:09 - 39:50)
But I do want to ask about Joe Rogan because you did do this interview with Rogan. He's been impersonating you, I don't know if you've seen this clip, saying, have you been there, blah, blah. And this whole debate got very meta.

You were arguing against the fact that he hadn't had enough experts on Israel, particularly, and Ukraine, and him and David Smith were sort of debating you on that. You've written about lots of topics over the last couple of years, Islam, climate change, the Troubles, southern border, rise of China, Israel, JFK's murder, DEI, Christianity, and many more. I'm looking at your byline on various different newspapers.

Some people would argue that you're not an expert on all of those things. So does that contradict your point slightly?

[Speaker 1] (39:50 - 44:55)
No, not at all. No, I'm very careful about what I talk about and what I write about, and I make sure I write about and talk about the things I know about. But I think that it's, furthermore, I mean, I think, I don't wanna go on about it because this is rather boring, but I think that there seems to be some kind of misunderstanding, which is that what I was saying to Joe was new media has, to a great extent, supplanted old media.

I think that Joe Rogan probably has a bigger impact than, say, the Washington Post these days, or certainly more impact than the Atlantic Magazine or the New Statesman. And therefore, there's an interesting moment in the media landscape, which is old media made a lot of mistakes. There are a lot of reasons to distrust the New York Times, for instance.

But just because old media has made mistakes does not mean there are absolutely no rules that do exist in media, and no, as it were, gates that do exist. A point I made there, which seems to have been lost, is if you're writing about a country, ordinarily, you ought to know the country. For instance, you do not have the GB News, Washington correspondent, living in Liverpool.

And there's a reason for that, which is that you simply can't cover DC politics unless you're in DC, at least on a pretty regular basis. That is totally normal. And when you're reporting on a war, and when you're writing about a war, it's perfectly normal.

In fact, it is standard practice that you ought to have been to see the war and to know the region. And I'm slightly bewildered, though, as so many people who think that's some kind of bizarre gatekeeping thing. People can say whatever the hell they want.

I'm certainly not one to try to stop that. They can, as we all know, we're short of incitement to kill people and so on. Free speech rights are very considerable, particularly in the United States.

People can sound off all they want, but there are also some things that are true and some things that are not. And I do believe that if you have experience in a country, you are likely to know more about it than somebody who has absolutely no experience in the country. An obvious way I've said this since that discussion was Joe knows an awful lot about MMA fighting, I suspect more than you.

And if you were to go on Joe's podcast and try to talk for three hours about MMA fighting, and it turned out you'd never been to a fight, and you didn't know the rules, and you'd actually just read about Wikipedia reports of some MMA rules, and you kept getting it wrong, he would call you out on it. And my simple suggestion was, why not do this on very, very important things bigger than a fight? And the one that stood out, or the two that stood out to me were, sorry, three, keep growing, were wildly unbalanced guest choices in regard to the war in Ukraine, wildly unbalanced guest choices in relation to the war in Gaza and Israel, and thirdly, the wild misrepresentation of 20th century history by pseudo-historians who are just regurgitating a type of history that was debunked many years ago and never had any mainstream purchase. In which, by the way, in that third one, there is something that maybe British people like us feel particularly sensitive about, but for good reason, which is that I can't bear seeing some of these guests who are doing the rounds on some of the podcasts in the US, right-wing podcasts, pretending that Hitler wasn't all that bad, and that the great villain of the 20th century was Winston Churchill.

No, no, no. When they were coming for Churchill from the left, I wrote about this in my book, The War in the West, that the people who were doing that were doing it for a specific reason, and people like me opposed them because they were misrepresenting history and they were trying to rob the British people of one of our great heroes. Well, it's the same thing when they try to do it from the right.

They are trying to misrepresent history, they are misrepresenting Britain's story, they are misrepresenting one of Britain's great heroes, and I don't see any reason why it should happen without being contested.

[Speaker 2] (44:56 - 45:07)
Obviously, on the Joe Rogan podcast, Dave Smith and Joe Rogan argued against you on that point. They said that Darrell Cooper, the historian, or not historian, the commentator, I don't know how to describe him.

[Speaker 1] (45:07 - 45:09)
That's the thing, it's all shape-shifting.

[Speaker 2] (45:09 - 45:12)
Yeah, right. But they said that he wasn't making the points that you just said.

[Speaker 1] (45:12 - 45:15)
Well, anyone can go online and see that I'm correct.

[Speaker 2] (45:15 - 45:19)
Okay. You couldn't remember his name, Darrell Cooper's name, when you went on the podcast.

[Speaker 1] (45:20 - 45:24)
Some people- It was a slightly deliberate signal of my contempt.

[Speaker 2] (45:24 - 45:26)
So you weren't unprepared.

[Speaker 1] (45:26 - 46:13)
Okay. Okay. I mean, you will understand, many people viewing will understand, some of the landscape in the era of the new media is really fetid, and that's inevitable.

But I believe that there are very many serious historians, not least very many serious British historians at the moment whose work deserves serious attention. And I do not care to help promulgate the theories or big up the delusions of total fakes and frauds.

[Speaker 2] (46:14 - 46:28)
Do you not think it's interesting to at least have the debate about Churchill's legacy? I agree with you that Cooper- We've had it for years. But in many ways, Cooper, I think he misrepresents a lot of this, particularly what happens- Why are we talking about him?

In the 1930s. But perhaps he makes some legitimate criticisms.

[Speaker 1] (46:28 - 46:32)
Okay, but perhaps if you look at the entrails of a chicken, you'll find something to tell you about the future.

[Speaker 2] (46:32 - 46:36)
Okay. Do you think that Joe Rogan has platformed anti-Semites?

[Speaker 1] (46:37 - 46:48)
I'm not gonna get trapped on this. There are many people that he's had that I dislike. I would like to see him simply have more of a balance of opinion.

[Speaker 2] (46:48 - 46:48)
Right.

[Speaker 1] (46:48 - 46:49)
But that's all I have to say.

[Speaker 2] (46:49 - 46:51)
But it's not about anti-Semitism itself?

[Speaker 1] (46:51 - 48:29)
It's about misrepresenting things that are going on in the moment. Again, if you invite somebody on who is playing a very dark game and trying to cover it over, I think that person should be challenged. I think that the choice of guests, the selection of guests matters.

I mean, it's so frustrating that you're going down this road because all I'm arguing for is some kind of standard. And I know that expertise has let a lot of people down in recent years. I agree.

I said repeatedly on that podcast, I agree. We had the conspiracy theory of the Lab League, which decimated public trust when we were told that this thing that we were told was conspiracy turned out not to be. We were talking earlier about the conspiracy theory of the Great Replacement of Zon.

Just because there are some things that are called conspiracies that turn out to be true does not mean that all conspiracy theories are true. And just because many experts have got things wrong does not mean expertise should not matter. Just because some journalists have got things wrong does not mean that journalistic standards should be completely thrown out of the window.

It's a very straightforward claim I'm making. I would like to see it applied to the right as well as to the left.

[Speaker 2] (48:30 - 48:51)
By the way, I agree with you. There should be absolute standards. And I really wish that Joe Rogan puts Andrew Roberts on and talks about Churchill, and I'm glad that he had you on.

I think that some people's criticism of you, and I'm not saying I necessarily agree with this, is that you spent so much time talking about his selection of guests that it had a whiff of sort of gatekeeping, or sort of trying to...

[Speaker 1] (48:51 - 48:54)
Well, that's another one, isn't it? Again, that's not my problem, but...

[Speaker 2] (48:55 - 48:56)
Or deplatforming.

[Speaker 1] (48:56 - 49:15)
No, just, again, just because some people have done gatekeeping that has tried to keep out majority opinion from the mainstream does not mean you should lift every sluice in your society and let the sewage just run right through it.

[Speaker 2] (49:16 - 50:03)
Yeah, let's talk about the book. So, as I said earlier, I think my favourite book from you since The Strained Death of Europe, absolutely brilliant. Millions of people in the West and Muslims, and Western Muslims, believe three things, and you talk about this in the book.

Gaza is a concentration camp. Israel is committing genocide against Palestinians. And they believe that tens of thousands of children have been murdered by Israel over the last couple of years.

Is there any accuracy to any of these three points? And how does one sort of persuade people who genuinely and sincerely believe that? Because I mean, you've probably interviewed them, I've interviewed people, left-wing people, radical Muslims, who are

incredibly emotive and genuinely believe that Israel is committing some kind of genocide here.

[Speaker 1] (50:03 - 55:51)
Well, first thing is they should read my book or any other book which is by somebody who's seen what I've seen, spoken to the number of people I've spoken to, survivors, families, families of hostages, people who witnessed Hamas's barbarism up close, and been with the IDF during their operations in Gaza and Lebanon to try to fulfil the two aims of Israel's war, which are to return the kidnapped hostages, many of whom are still in captivity as we speak, and secondly, to destroy the leadership of Hamas and make Hamas effectively operationally incapable. To take just those three lies which you cite, anyone who knows what Gaza was like before October the 7th, 2023, it's a very different place now because of the choices that Hamas made, anyone who knows anything about Gaza could tell quite a lot of tells of why Gaza in no way resembled a concentration camp, which is a deliberate smear which people use because they know that if you use the accusation concentration camp against the Jewish state, you will particularly wound and upset Jews. That's why they do it. That's why they don't say, it's a shame that, well, no, it's a shame that more food trucks can't come in as it was, there's no shortage of food trucks, but that they can't come in without having to be searched because they have to be searched because of missiles, but we understand or something like that.

Gaza's population almost doubled from the time that every Jew was torn from their homes by the IDF in Gaza in 2005 and the whole territory given over to the Palestinian people who then voted in Hamas. In the time from 2005 when every Jew was made to leave Gaza because everybody seems to agree that one of the natural things of the Palestinians is they can't have a single Jew near them. That seems for some reason to be a completely acceptable opinion.

From the time, the withdrawal in 2005 to October the 7th, 2023, the population of Gaza almost doubled. Even the people who make the outrageous claims about Israel's military actions and military response to the 7th of October, they can't reconcile in their heads the lies they're saying. For instance, they will say that the population of Gaza is disproportionately young.

That does happen to be true, but you'll notice that you have a choice between those two things, don't you? Either it's a concentration camp or it's a place where the population doubles and people are able to have a lot of children. You will notice that there was no doubling of the population in Bergen-Belsen in the 1940s.

So it's one of the many reasons why it's totally obscene. The other reason is, by the way, that anyone who knows anything about Gaza between 2005 and 2023, and again, I give many examples in the book, will know that actually, compared to the rest of the region, other Arab countries in the region, other Muslim countries in the region, Gaza was pretty much like, some of them actually living standards were higher in Gaza than some of their neighbors and they had shopping malls and swimming pools and leisure centers and marketplaces and actually the strip along the beach was really a rather nice bit of town. Billions of dollars were poured into Gaza in international aid from other people in the region

by British taxpayers, American taxpayers, EU taxpayers and others. Billions of dollars were not poured in to Auschwitz in the 1940s.

It's like, this is just obscene. You'll notice that people were not driving luxury cars around Treblinka in the 1940s. This is obscene.

But as I say, people make that accusation because they want to wound the Jewish state. Concentration camp is a very good way to do that, by claiming that. The other two examples you give of disproportionately the death of children, certainly children will have been killed in fighting in Gaza, certainly.

We cannot rely on the Hamas numbers which they give out, which are the only numbers that can be, which any of the Western media decide can actually be used. But the best analysts of the war from outside have said that in the whole history of warfare, it's highly unlikely there has been a war before where in such a dense area, which is completely booby-trapped, was completely booby-trapped, and much more by Hamas in the 18 years they ran Gaza, that in very few, if not no occasions in the history of war has civilian casualty to terrorist death been so low that it is roughly one terrorist to one civilian dead. Now, if that means it's 15,000 Hamas terrorists killed, maybe that means there are 30,000 Palestinians killed.

This is terrible, terrible. But this is a war that Hamas started, and they didn't have to start the war. And the accusation that Israel would be deliberately targeting children is another of the outrageous smears.

The third one you gave, just remind me quickly, was?

[Speaker 2] (55:51 - 55:51)
The second one was genocide.

[Speaker 1] (55:52 - 1:00:52)
The third one was the kids. Genocide, again. Genocide was what Hamas attempted on the 7th of October, when 4,000 of their terrorists, along with Islamic Jihad, broke into Israel, went into innocent people's homes and burned them alive in their homes, and went through the Nova music party of young people simply dancing in the early hours of the morning and raped and murdered their way through that party.

That was an attempted genocide. By the way, Hezbollah were meant to do the same thing from the north, and thank goodness that Hamas and Hezbollah weren't able to communicate. It's something I go into in the book.

Weren't able to communicate to make sure that it was coordinated. If it had have been, exactly the same thing would have come from the north. As it was, Hezbollah didn't have the advance notice, and they just joined in with rocket fire from the aid.

But the genocide was what Hamas and their allies want to commit. Genocide is what their backers, the Iranian revolutionary government in Iran, say they want to carry out. If Israel had wanted to commit genocide in Gaza, I mean, first of all, they wouldn't.

Secondly, they could have done if they'd have wanted to. If they just simply wanted to kill everyone in Gaza, the Israeli Air Force could have gone in on October the 8th and done that. There would not be, currently, hundreds and hundreds of dead Israeli soldiers, reservists and others of your age and younger, Israeli soldiers killed in the line of duty because they were going through Gaza so carefully.

If they'd have wanted to commit genocide, Israel wouldn't have lost all of these young men and women. They lost them because of the rules of war that they follow, that Hamas absolutely not only refuses to follow, but uses against them. But the interesting thing about all of these allegations is this.

I say at one point in the book, there's a very, very interesting line that I borrow from a great Soviet writer, Vasily Grossman, which is, tell me what you accuse the Jews of, I'll tell you what you're guilty of. This held true, as Grossman says in the 1950s, held true for antisemites throughout history. And by the way, of course, I have to add the caveat, but it's true, not all criticism of Israel is antisemitic.

But when you hold Israel to double standards and different standards than you would hold any other country to, then yes, that's antisemitism. But Grossman's line, tell me what you accuse the Jews of, I'll tell you what you're guilty of, absolutely characterizes all of these things. The Hamas supporters in Britain and elsewhere support a movement that wanted to commit genocide.

So they accuse the Israelis of genocide. They support people who slaughtered children in their homes on the 7th of October without mercy, with glee, with delight. So they accuse Israel of wanting to kill children.

They want a concentration camp for the Jews. They want the annihilation of the Jews. They love the idea of the annihilation of the Jews.

So they accuse the Jews of setting up a concentration camp. This rule holds absolutely consistently. One of the other things they accuse of, just look the other month, there are a bunch of weird left-wingers in Britain and elsewhere who started sending out this slurry of stories online claiming that the Israeli defense forces in Gaza had been raping women in the Shifa Hospital, I think it was, it was the Hamas command headquarters.

And they say, aha, the IDF are rapists. You have spent the last 18 months supporting rapists. You spent the last 18 months denying rapes or glorifying rapes or supporting the people who carry out rapes, who go pro their abuse of women on October the 7th, who record it, who broadcast it, who are proud of it.

You support those people for 18 months and then you accuse the Israelis of raping? Every single time this rule holds. And the people who have been making these totally false allegations against the Israelis since October the 7th, and where they didn't on the 7th, and many did, they started on the 8th of October.

Every time they have told us about themselves, the people who have marched through London week after week who don't give a darn about anything else other than Jews never

winning. Those people make lurid accusation after lurid accusation against the world's one Jewish state because they accuse it of things that they themselves like and want.

[Speaker 2] (1:00:53 - 1:01:15)
You quote Vassily Grossman throughout the book, obviously an incredible writer who documented some of the worst crimes of the 20th century, which was a truly bloody, terrible century. And you write in the book, you saw protests around the world just after October 7th, immediately supporting what Hamas did, which is shocking.

[Speaker 1] (1:01:15 - 1:01:18)
The first ones in London were on the evening of the 7th.

[Speaker 2] (1:01:18 - 1:01:20)
While the actual atrocities were still on.

[Speaker 1] (1:01:20 - 1:01:48)
On the evening of the 7th, certain British left-wingers and Muslims couldn't resist going straight out onto the streets to celebrate, and we have much documentary evidence of it. And then on the 8th, they really got organised. And in Britain, they asked for their permits to protest against Israel.

They asked for the permits on the 7th as the massacre was going on, and they turned out on the streets on the 8th as the massacres were still going on. These are sick people we have in our midst.

[Speaker 2] (1:01:49 - 1:02:08)
So you say in the book, everywhere the same thought came to my mind. What has it got to do with you? Now, I want to put that question to you as well.

I mean, having read the book, I think I know the answer. But why have you sort of become so obsessed with this issue? What sparked the interest with you?

[Speaker 1] (1:02:08 - 1:02:11)
I'm, well, what you call my obsession with the issue...

[Speaker 2] (1:02:11 - 1:02:12)
I'm not saying it's a bad thing.

[Speaker 1] (1:02:13 - 1:10:14)
I'm deeply engrossed in the issue and committed to it for several reasons. One is that as a journalist, I've seen a lot of this up close and I can't bear the lies. And that's been the case for some 20 years now on this conflict.

I was in Israel during the 2006 Lebanon war, Hezbollah war, and saw then for the first time myself the unbelievably skewed nature of reporting on, for instance, the BBC about this conflict where Hezbollah would fire rockets into towns I was in in the north of Israel. And then you'd look at the BBC news the next day and it would have, you know, Israelis bomb Lebanon as if they'd just done it for no reason and the initial thing hadn't happened. So there's that.

I think in terms of just honesty in reporting, honesty in understanding the situation, it gets under my skin because I don't think any country, not even Britain or America these days, is as lied about and as libeled as the state of Israel is. Not even the American armed forces or the British armed forces are lied about as much as the Israeli armed forces. And I think that this is something which should get under the skin of anyone who reports on this.

But I think the thing underneath your question is, yes, I mean, when I wasn't in the Middle East in the last couple of years, or when I returned from there to Canada, America, Australia, Britain, France, almost everywhere there were these protests against Israel. I remember in snowy Ottawa one day, there were these anti-Israel protesters, and I think, well, I mean, you're in Ottawa. What's it got to do with you?

Or in Melbourne or Sydney? Are you on the other end of the world? You guys didn't turn out when hundreds of thousands of people were being killed in Yemen far more than had been killed in Gaza.

You weren't out on the streets week after week during the Syrian Civil War. You're not on the streets now for the actual genocide going on in Sudan. Why this one?

Well, my belief is, and I say this in the book, that I think that the jihadists and the Hamas lovers and the death cult worshippers, I think they have deliberately put their finger on something, whether they know it or not, which is that their belief, as stated by people like the Columbia Students protesters, their belief is that you should destroy Israel first and all of the rest of the West next.

And they see the destruction of the world's one Jewish state as being achievable more easily than the destruction of the United States of America, where we're sitting, or the United Kingdom, where we're from. They see the eradication of the one Jewish state as being the nearest achievable goal and the overthrow of all other Western societies as the next step. Why do they think that?

Or why do they believe that? Why are they so head up about it? It's animated by a form of antisemitism which most Westerners don't understand, and why would they, which is Islamic antisemitism, which is its own strain, separate, I think, from Christian antisemitism and separate from left, right, fascist, communist antisemitism that have existed in the past.

Islamic antisemitism has its own driver. It is, to quote somebody I don't often quote, to quote Mehdi Hassan, somebody who used to be a journalist from the UK, said some years ago in a left-wing magazine, in the New Statesman, that Muslim antisemitism is, quote, "'rife, routine, and commonplace among British Muslims.'" Mehdi Hassan's words, not mine. Routine and commonplace.

Why are British Muslims so animated about Israel? The Jews were among the first people to reject the revelation of Muhammad. They have shown that you can create a booming and successful state surrounded by Muslim states, which are, to say the least, not places you, I, or any other Westerner would love to live.

You might say Dubai at times, but frankly, all these places are on some kind of borrowed time or slightly weird enclaves. Enclaves. And in the end, it comes down, that form of

antisemitism, that form of anti-Israelism, comes down to a desire to cut Western civilization at its root.

Western civilization is, as everybody should know or does know, a combination of the inheritance of the Bible and of the ancient Greek and Roman worlds, of Athens and Jerusalem. If you want to destroy Western civilization, to take out Jerusalem is to cut our civilization at the root. It is to completely destroy the tree that has given our civilization life.

So in some ways, they have chosen their target well. And I believe that if you don't want to see that happen, if you don't want to see the complete eradication of Western civilization, then no, you don't have to support absolutely everything the state of Israel does. You don't have to understand everything about it, but you should understand what the radicals today are trying to do.

They are trying to upend the whole civilization starting with the one Jewish state. And there's a rule that I have about this, which I hope people might recognize as something they might have seen with their own eyes. When there is, because it was one of the things that first alerted me to this pattern, when there is an anti-Israel protest in London, Birmingham, or anywhere else in the UK, just as in New York.

But you will notice in the UK when there is an anti-Israel protest, there is never a British flag. There will be Palestinian flags. There may be Hamas flags or Hezbollah flags or flags of other jihadist terrorist organizations.

You'll never see a British flag. You'll notice that whenever they finish, they do not sing God Save the King. You'll notice that on the few occasions there have been pro-Israel protests in London in solidarity with Israel after October the 7th and the massacre of 1,200 people and the kidnapping of 250 more.

You will notice that whenever there has been a pro-Israel protest, there will be British flags and Israeli flags. It will finish with the singing of the Israeli national anthem and the singing of God Save the King. If you are in America and you see anti-Israel protests, there will never be the Stars and Stripes flying there, and they will never be singing the Star-Spangled Banner.

In fact, in Washington, D.C. a little while ago when I was there and there was an anti-Israel protest, the protesters located the American flags they could at the tops of the flagpoles in Washington, D.C. and burnt them on the floor of the American Capitol. They are telling us something very clear. It's Israel first, but all of you next, and I think we should believe them and recognize them.

So those people want Israel to lose and they want Hamas to win. I want Israel to win and I want Hamas and all of their backers to lose. Fine, we disagree, and we'll see who wins.

[Speaker 2] (1:10:15 - 1:11:25)
One of the main differences I've noticed moving from London to Washington is on the right, there's a lot more skepticism of Israel in the United States than there is in Britain that I've seen. Now, that may not be mainstream in the U.S., but there's a lot of people, at least online on the right, who are much more skeptical of Israel. And just people working in D.C.,

working in the Senate, working in the House, I've met lots of staffers who are more skeptical, who, by the way, I don't think are necessarily anti-Semitic, I'm just saying more skeptical. And they would question your idea of Israel being connected with Christianity, so this Judeo-Christian phrase, for example, and that Israel is very important to America. And perhaps one of the things they may cite recently was that Israel, and this is just one example, the official Israel X account posted on Twitter after the Pope died, rest in peace, Pope Francis, may his memory be a blessing alongside a picture of the Pope visiting the Western Wall in Jerusalem. That was then deleted, and according to the Jerusalem Post, officials at the Foreign Ministry suggested that this was because the Pope had made statements against Israel.

What do you make of that? Do you think that that's slightly insulting?

[Speaker 1] (1:11:26 - 1:11:52)
That's just Twittering, I mean, I don't think that's of any significance. I mean, I'm interested in the deeper thing, I'm interested in what is real, not in what a couple of people notice on Twitter. I mean, usually, in my experience, when somebody cites something like that, it's because they are kind of lazy and think that some kind of Twitter fart is the real world.

[Speaker 2] (1:11:52 - 1:12:05)
Well, perhaps the more real argument might be, for example, over Easter, Israel, and I think for perfectly reasonable reasons, limited the amount of Palestinian Christians that were able to go into the Holy Temple in Jerusalem.

[Speaker 1] (1:12:05 - 1:15:00)
No, there's always vast numbers of people in Jerusalem over Easter. I've been there myself. I think you may have listened to some very ill-informed staffers, that the holy places are certainly better preserved now than at most times throughout history.

Christians in Israel and in Jerusalem have worshipped at the Holy Sepulchre. The main problem for Christians at the Holy Sepulchre on Easter is other Christians, because usually what happens is the Palestinian Muslims who have the keys to the Holy Sepulchre have usually Jewish army and other guards there to stop the Christians from killing each other, because, have you been to the Holy Sepulchre? All right, well, every denomination in Christendom has a chapel or a bit of a church to itself.

So a lot of Israeli troops at some point, or Israeli police have at some point in their career had to separate out warring Armenian Christians from having fights and literally sometimes punch-ups with Greek Orthodox Christians or Russian Orthodox Christians. It's an amazingly complicated melting pot of the world's faiths. But no, I mean, the idea that there's any anti-Christianism in Israel, that they're deeply proud of their Christian populations.

I cite Christians in the book who are proud Israelis who've been affected by events of recent years. No, I mean, I don't know. You've probably spoken to some of the wing in American politics that does exist, which believes that just America, America doesn't need any allies in the world and shouldn't be involved in the world.

And so there is a sort of, there is a ecosystem that basically misleads people about what the realities are on the ground there, gets things wrong, will claim things like Bethlehem has

been cleared of Christians and they don't realize that that's because of the PA, the Palestinian Authority that's in charge of that part of the West Bank, Judea and Samaria, has very, very carefully, that this is Palestinian Muslims, has very carefully cleansed, ethnically cleansed Bethlehem of Christians since they've had rule over that area. The people you're speaking to, I think, probably don't know any of these details, but I would guess that there are people who have what I regard as the unanswerable, unsolvable question of the isolationist American right, which is that they want America to be the world's dominant power, but they don't want any involvement in the world.

[Speaker 2] (1:15:00 - 1:15:13)
Okay, so you've touched on a really great issue to end the interview. This is between the so-called America First movement and perhaps a sort of the opposite to that, I don't know how you want to be described, but you once wrote a book called Neoconservatism and Why We Need It.

[Speaker 1] (1:15:13 - 1:15:15)
Yes, that's right. Found some 20 years ago now.

[Speaker 2] (1:15:16 - 1:15:32)
And I wanted to ask you whether you sort of stood by this term. Are you still a neoconservative? Do you believe in the Iraq war?

Do you think that the Afghanistan war were justifiable? And do you think that there should be a sort of more hawkish and neocon response to foreign policy in the States today?

[Speaker 1] (1:15:32 - 1:18:56)
This is too many things going on in that question. Neocon and hawkish are not the same thing. I gave up on the term neocon many years ago because I thought it had become effectively, it's even more useless than liberal as a term these days because it just, nobody knows what it means.

Yeah, I mean, I've changed my views on some things in my career, certainly in the last 20 years. I believe that America should be judicious in its use of military power, as Britain should be. I think that we are not good at state building and some people may say I'm a slow learner on that one and I might concede that.

But I think that since we haven't proved very good at state building, we should be very wary of that. But I do believe in the use of American and Western military power when it's needed. And I don't think that you can afford, I certainly don't think that the United States of America can afford to retreat completely from the world.

I think it can use its army and its treasure wisely, of course, and has it been used unwisely in the past, definitely. But that does not mean that America should withdraw from the world and the main reason I hold that view is that I believe that America and Britain have been enormous forces for good in the world, enormous forces for good in the world. We have certainly been greater forces for good than any of the rivals or competitors who would like to take our place.

And the people who you might speak to in DC and who I speak to and certainly hear from and find stimulating and sometimes my friends, but who believe that America should just have no involvement in the world essentially, should have a strong military but never use it, I think that one of those things that they never take into account is that if America wants to remain the dominant power, America has to remain committed in the world. There are burdens associated with that but it is much more desirable that America leads the world than that the Chinese Communist Party does. And as I say, if America, for instance, or the Western alliance doesn't want to keep open the world's waterways, you can bet your bottom dollar the Chinese Communist Party would love to do so.

And so yes, I'm a bit bewildered by the argument that I hear but which I smell from your question, simply because there is a form of left-wing anti-Americanism which I and others have written about a lot in recent decades. But I think there is a form of anti-American right-wingism as well and that is basically, we can't do any good in the world, we're no good when we do anything. It's all rotten when it comes from us, we're responsible for everything in the world that goes wrong.

I don't think any of that is true. I think it's a weird form of right-wing anti-Americanism. I'm not willing to concede to anti-Americanism or anti-British sentiment when it comes from the left and I'm not tempted by it when it comes from the right either.

Thank you.